

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 651

HE 021 521

AUTHOR Duronio, Margaret; And Others
TITLE A Survey of Fund Raising Methods: Implications for Management.
SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 29p. ; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administration; Alumni; Corporate Support; Educational Finance; Endowment Funds; Financial Needs; *Financial Support; Foundation Programs; *Fund Raising; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Evaluation; National Surveys; Private Financial Support
IDENTIFIERS *Funding Formulas

ABSTRACT

A year-long study to examine the relationships of higher education institutional characteristics, fund raising methods, and fund raising expenditures to voluntary support outcomes in institutions of higher education was undertaken. The initial results of the survey on college fund raising methods are presented, and a discussion of the implications for management of fund raising programs is provided. Research for this phase of the study looks at the basic features of fund raising programs in institutions of higher education and the difference in prevalence of certain features among private and public institutions and among institutions with high and low outcomes in voluntary support. Methodology is discussed with a focus on the public and private institutions included and the fund raising methods survey. Results are discussed in terms of: planning, goal-setting, and evaluation; donor programs (non-alumni gifts, and corporation and foundation gifts); differences among sets of institutions; duration of programs; administrative support systems; and ratings of programs. Results indicate that though some differences did occur between private and public institutions and between institutions with high and low outcomes in voluntary support, there are more common features than differentiating ones. Resulting messages to practitioners and managers in fund raising are (1) to expand and develop the institution's capacity to conduct systematic evaluation of the current fund raising programs, management procedures, and outcomes and (2) to challenge and seek to verify all assumptions made about the institution's limits regarding fund raising outcomes. Tables are included. (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 296651



University of Pittsburgh

VICE PRESIDENT FOR UNIVERSITY RELATIONS
AND DEVELOPMENT

A SURVEY OF FUND RAISING METHODS: IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT

Margaret A. Duronio
Manager, Resource Development

Bruce A. Loessin
Vice President for University Relations
and Development

Georgina L. Borton
Director of Corporation and Foundation Relations

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARGARET A.

DURONIO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Research for this paper was supported in part by a grant to the
authors from the Exxon Education Foundation.

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Nancy Belli, Research
Assistant, in the completion of this project.

Paper Presented at the 1988 Annual Conference
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, LA

LOEFFLER BUILDING, 121 MEYRAN AVENUE, PITTSBURGH, PA 15213 (412) 683-0125

HE 021 521

INTRODUCTION

There is no strong tradition of basic research in higher education fund raising. At a time when demands for increased performance in fund raising are highest, there is insufficient empirical evidence based on national statistics to drive and support program planning, goal-setting, and evaluation.

The intent of our year-long study was to examine the relationships of institutional characteristics, fund raising expenditures, and fund raising methods to voluntary support outcomes in higher education institutions.

Findings to Date

General findings from earlier parts of this research were:

1. high outcomes (relative to type of institution) for each donor group are possible for each type of private and public institution;
2. across all institutions, fund raising expenditures, institutional budget, and endowment have high correlations (from .784 to .732) with total voluntary support;
3. across all institutions, alumni of record, type of institution, expenditures per student, and enrollment have moderate correlations (from .684 to .579) with total voluntary support;
4. across all institutions, age of institution, tuition, and private or public status have low correlations (from .276 to .117) with total voluntary support;
5. there is considerable variation in the relationships between factors and outcomes by and within types, private or public status of institution, and donor group;
6. some commonly-held notions about the relationships of institutional characteristics and fund raising success are inappropriate

generalizations about the specific experiences of certain (usually private) institutions with certain donor groups; and

7. our current level of knowledge and beliefs about fund raising success do not adequately explain why some institutions raise considerably more money than others similar to them.

The purpose of this paper is to present the initial results of our survey on fund raising methods and discuss the implications for management of fund raising programs. Working papers, some still in preparation, on other aspects of the research, a review of the literature, and a final summary report are noted in the references and are available from the authors.

Research Questions for Fund Raising Methods Survey

Research questions for this phase of the study included:

1. What are the basic features of fund raising programs in higher education institutions?
2. Does the prevalence of certain features differ among private and public institutions and among institutions with high and low outcomes in voluntary support?

METHODOLOGY

Institutions

Each year the Council for Financial Aid to Education (CFAE) invites approximately 2,700 colleges and universities to participate in a fund raising survey. Results are printed annually in the report, Voluntary Support to Education. Over the past four years, an average of 1,200 American institutions have responded each year. Although institutions reporting each year represent only about one-third of America's colleges and universities, these institutions claim 85% of the estimated annual total dollars in voluntary support to higher education (CFAE, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987). For example, the national estimate of total voluntary support

to higher education for 1985-86 was \$7.4 billion. The 1,230 institutions responding to the CFAE survey for that year claimed \$6.37 billion of that total (CFAE, 1987, p. 3).

Typically declining to report each year are the same four major research universities. It is estimated (based on study findings reported in Working Paper #3) that as much as 10% of the unreported dollars included in the national estimate for any one year may be raised by these four institutions alone. Therefore, the institutions which do respond to the CFAE survey are believed to be representative of institutions where fund raising efforts are significant.

For inclusion in the study, we selected private and public institutions of the following ten types: research universities, doctoral universities, comprehensive universities, baccalaureate colleges, and two-year colleges. Then we identified all higher education institutions of these types which reported fund raising results to CFAE for the years 1982-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85. This group numbered 575 institutions.

After data on institutional characteristics were collected from published sources for each of these institutions, chief development officers were asked to participate in a survey on fund raising expenditures. After the initial request and two follow-ups, we had a total of 311 usable questionnaires (54%). We were not able to detect any particular pattern (for type, private or public status, or total voluntary support) among the non-respondents.

From this group of 311, ten institutions of each type, for a total of 100, were selected at random for inclusion in the study of fund raising methods. Actual number participating in the methods survey was 73, described by type as indicated in Table 1. These institutions were located

Table 1

Number and Type of Institutions Participating in Fund Raising Methods Survey

<u>Type of Institution</u>	<u>Status</u>	
	<u>Private</u>	<u>Public</u>
Research universities	6	7
Doctoral universities	7	8
Comprehensive universities	6	9
Baccalaureate colleges	8	8
Two-year colleges	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	37	36

in 31 states, dispersed geographically as follows: (a) Northeast, 20; (b) Southeast, 18; (c) North Central, 18; (d) South Central, 18; (e) Northwest, 3; and (f) Southwest, 5.

Table 2 shows ranges and medians of outcome variables and selected independent variables (i.e., those with high positive correlations to outcomes) for these institutions. As the data indicate, institutions in this part of the study are widely dispersed throughout the country and have enrollments, endowments, budgets, and voluntary support outcomes ranging from modest to considerable. Because of random selection, these institutions are representative of the institutions responding to the earlier survey on fund raising expenditures. However, since we did not determine empirically if the group from which these 73 were selected was representative of the the total population, the results presented here are not intended to be representative of all higher education institutions.

Private institutions in this survey have higher medians than public for total support, non-alumni gifts, foundation gifts, endowment, and fund raising expenditures, while public institutions have higher medians for alumni gifts, corporation gifts, institutional budget, and enrollment. In general, the differences between medians for these private and public institutions reflect the general pattern for private and public institutions in the overall study group of 575 institutions, with one exception. For the larger group, the median for private alumni gifts is higher than for public. The extreme difference in the ranges in this group of institutions (with a spread of \$32.7 million for private and only \$7.8 million for public) accounts for the atypically higher median for public alumni gifts.

In another part of the overall study, all institutions were ranked within types from high to low for total voluntary support, and for gifts

Table 2

Outcome and Descriptive Variables: Ranges and Medians for Private and Public Institutions

VARIABLE	PRIVATE (n = 37)		PUBLIC (n = 36)	
	RANGE	MEDIAN	RANGE	MEDIAN
OUTCOMES				
Total Support	63,500,000 - 202,000	1,250,000	39,100,000 - 82,000	844,000
Alumni gifts	32,700,000 - 17,000	199,000	7,800,000 - 0	246,000
Non-alumni gifts	15,100,000 - 60,000	507,000	12,293,000 - 2,000	276,000
Corporation gifts	17,760,000 - 35,000	200,000	23,194,000 - 3,000	341,000
Foundation gifts	14,800,000 - 2,000	374,000	10,954,000 - 1,000	236,000
DESCRIPTIVE				
Institutional budget	363,500,000 - 1,600,000	11,500,000	703,658,000 - 2,309,000	12,863,000
Endowment	1,356,400,000 - 79,000	6,613,000	155,429,000 - 0	1,854,000
Fund Raising Expenses	6,800,000 - 37,000	330,000	5,757,000 - 5,000	210,000
Enrollment	36,000 - 293	1,801	62,300 - 1,600	11,900

NOTE: All figures are reported in dollars except those for enrollment which are actual numbers.

from each donor group. Each institution received five separate ratings: one for total voluntary support and one for each donor group. Institutions of each type were ranked on the outcome variable from high to low. Each group was then divided into thirds to represent high, middle, and low levels for the outcome variable. Based on the median for each level, individual institutions within types were assigned a rating of from 7 (high) to 1 representing degree of success in fund raising. A rating of 4 indicated that the outcome was at the median for that type.

To determine high and low groups for this analysis, institutions with original ratings of 1, 2, or 3 were assigned to the low group; institutions with ratings of 4, 5, 6, or 7 were assigned to the high group. Table 3 shows the number of institutions by status and outcome in the high and low groups. As these data indicate, high and low groups for each outcome have a fairly balanced number of private and public institutions.

Fund Raising Methods Survey

The last phase of data collection for the overall research was a telephone survey on fund raising methods. We first wrote to chief development officers from the selected institutions, explaining the purpose and nature of the survey, and then followed up with a phone call to set an appointment to conduct the interview by phone.

Along with the experience of the authors, a review of the literature -- most notably all issues of CASE Currents for the past three years and the comprehensive fund raising handbooks edited by Rowland (1987) and Pray (1981) -- was used to develop items for inclusion in the questionnaire. A number of the University of Pittsburgh development staff, several of whom had been chief development officers at other institutions, participated in the testing and refining of the survey instrument.

Table 3

Number of Institutions with High/Low Rankings by Outcome

Group of Institutions	Number Ranked High	Number Ranked Low
Private Institutions (N = 37)		
for total voluntary support	17	20
for alumni gifts	15	22
for non-alumni gifts	17	20
for corporation gifts	20	17
for foundation gifts	16	21
Public Institutions (N = 36)		
for total voluntary support	20	6
for alumni gifts	22	14
for non-alumni gifts	18	18
for corporation gifts	18	18
for foundation gifts	17	19

The questionnaire covered (a) general procedures for goal-setting and evaluation; (b) administrative services, such as management information and donor research systems; (c) features of programs to solicit gifts from alumni, non-alumni individuals, corporations, and foundations; (d) longevity of programs for specific donor groups; and (e) respondents' ratings of overall success of programs for specific donor groups. Items were meant to be representative, not inclusive. For the most part, these items represent features that have been associated either in the literature or in general knowledge, with increased fund raising outcomes. However, inclusion of the items is not meant to imply that there is consensus among fund raisers, nor that the authors have made conclusions about the value of these features.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4 displays responses from all participants for the 46 items which required a "yes" or "no" answer. The table shows in descending order the number and percent of respondents who indicated that the feature specified in the item was present in their fund raising approach. As the figures show, the majority of institutions in this group have 31 of the 46 features.

Planning, Goal-Setting, and Evaluation

Half of the 46 items refer to various aspects of planning, goal-setting, and evaluation. Nearly all respondents indicated that both the previous year's total voluntary support and pre-set goals (95.9% and 93.2%, respectively) were important factors in year-end evaluation of outcomes. Fewer respondents reported using expenditures for fund raising to evaluate outcomes (67.1%) or outcomes from other institutions (58.9%), although all four methods were reported in use in the majority of institutions.

Table 4

Number and Percent of "Yes" Responses for All Institutions

No.	Item	Total N	Total %
1	corporation matching gifts program	73	100.0%
2	automated (part or total) management information system	72	98.6%
3	mass mailings for alumni gifts	70	95.9%
4	phonothons for alumni gifts	70	95.9%
5	use last year's total to evaluate outcomes	70	95.9%
6	use pre-set goals to evaluate outcomes	68	93.2%
7	fund raising staff involved in goal setting	65	89.0%
8	pre-set goals for total voluntary support	64	87.7%
9	president involved in fund raising goal setting	60	82.2%
10	solicit faculty/staff for non-alumni gifts program	60	82.2%
11	regional activities for alumni gifts	60	82.2%
12	system to identify new corporation donors	60	82.2%
13	system to identify alumni with potential for larger gift	58	79.5%
14	system to identify new non-alumni donors	58	79.5%
15	system to identify new foundation donors	58	79.5%
16	volunteers make calls for alumni phonothons	56	76.7%
17	pre-set goals for alumni gifts	56	76.7%
18	base goals on last year's outcomes	54	74.0%
19	performance evaluation of fund raising staff	52	71.2%
20	mass mailings for non-alumni gifts	51	69.9%
21	use expenditures to evaluate outcomes	49	67.1%
22	automated (part or total) donor research record system	48	65.8%
23	solicit non-student consumers for non-alumni gifts	45	61.6%
24	pre-set goals for non-alumni gifts	44	60.3%
25	solicit parents for non-alumni gifts	43	58.9%
26	use outcomes of other institutions to evaluate outcomes	43	58.9%
27	base goals on potential of each donor group	41	56.2%
28	solicit community at large for non-alumni gifts	40	54.8%
29	pre-set goals for foundation gifts	40	54.8%
30	pre-set goals for corporation gifts	40	54.8%
31	trustees involved in fund raising goal setting	38	52.1%
32	base goals on needs of institution	37	50.7%
33	phonothons for non-alumni gifts	36	49.3%
34	class agent program for alumni gifts	34	46.6%
35	solicit students for alumni gifts	33	45.2%
36	paid students make calls for alumni phonothons	32	43.8%
37	deans involved in fund raising goal setting	31	42.5%
38	finance administrators involved fund raising goal setting	29	39.7%
39	faculty involved in fund raising goal setting	22	30.1%
40	solicit spouses deceased alumni for non-alumni gifts	17	23.3%
41	international activities for corporation gifts	16	21.9%
42	mass mailings for corporation gifts	11	15.1%
43	international activities for alumni gifts	10	13.7%
44	paid outsiders make calls for alumni phonothons	10	13.7%
45	international activities for foundation gifts	8	11.0%
46	mass mailings for foundation gifts	5	6.8%

The majority of respondents also indicated that systematic efforts were underway to identify new prospects for each donor group (82.2% for corporation gifts, and 79.5% each for alumni, non-alumni, and foundation gifts).

Among the planning, goal-setting, and evaluation features cited with least frequency were those which identify who in each institution participates in goal-setting for fund raising. Widespread participation in goal-setting can be seen as, among other things, a measure of both the degree of importance attached to the development function and of the extent to which development is integrated into larger institutional concerns and priorities.

We asked about the participation of six different internal constituencies in goal-setting for fund raising. The constituencies participating with the chief development officer most often were other fund raising staff (89.0%) and the institution's president (82.2%). Trustees participated 52.1% of the time. Deans, financial administrators, and faculty participated in fewer than one-half of the institutions (42.5%, 39.7%, and 30.1%, respectively). These figures suggest that, beyond the fund raising staff and the president, direct involvement of other internal constituencies in fund raising planning is moderate at best.

One set of items asked respondents to specify if actual annual goals were established for total voluntary support and for each donor group. About 88% of respondents reported pre-set goals for total voluntary support, and about 77% reported pre-set goals for alumni gifts. For non-alumni gifts, the percentages dropped to about 60% and to about 55% each for corporation and foundation gifts. These figures suggest that setting goals for specific donor groups is either more challenging or perceived as less useful than setting goals for total voluntary support.

Donor Programs

Alumni gifts. Almost 96% of respondents reported using mass mailings and phonothons as alumni gift activities. Special regional activities to solicit alumni support were reported by 82.7%, and international activities by only 11%.

If respondents reported using phonothons, we asked them to indicate if callers were volunteers, paid student callers, and/or persons with no other connection to the institution who were hired to make solicitation calls. Volunteers made calls in almost 77% of the institutions and paid students in 43.8%. Only 10 respondents (13.7%) reported using paid "outsiders" to make calls.

Fewer than half of the respondents indicated that they solicit students for gifts or have a class agent system in support of alumni gift programs.

These figures indicate that phonothons involving volunteers, mass mailings, and regional activities, reported by more than 75% of respondents, are generally standard activities in alumni gifts programs.

Non-alumni gifts. Items for non-alumni gift programs were primarily related to identifying how institutions defined non-alumni donors. Results from other parts of the overall research (see Working Paper #3) indicate that non-alumni givers are the least well-defined donor group across institutions.

About 81% of respondents reported gift solicitation of faculty and staff. Other constituencies indicated by more than 50% were non-student consumers (i.e., persons who attended sports, cultural, or non-academic educational events sponsored by the institution - 61.7%), parents of current students (58.9%), and community members at large (54.8%). Only

23.3% of respondents reported solicitation of surviving spouses or children of deceased prominent alumni.

About 70% reported using mass mailings to solicit non-alumni gifts, but only 49.3% reported using phonothons to reach non-alumni donors.

Other than solicitation of faculty and staff, no other aspects of non-alumni gifts programs included in this survey clearly emerge as items of standard practice.

Corporation and foundation gifts. Every respondent reported having a corporation matching gifts program, the only item reported by 100% of respondents. International activities to solicit gifts from corporation and foundation donors were reported by 21.9% and 11.0%, respectively.

We asked respondents to indicate the extent of their corporation and foundation fund raising efforts outside their regional areas. The results to these items are shown in Table 5. The majority of all institutions (and the majority of all private and all public) reported minimum effort outside their regional areas for corporation gifts, although private institutions were about three times more likely than public to make extensive effort outside their regions. Extensive and moderate activities for foundation gifts were reported more frequently than for corporation gifts by all institutions, and by all private and public institutions.

Mass mailings to solicit gifts from corporations and foundations were reported by 15.1% and 6.8%, respectively. Aside from these items and those related to planning and goal-setting reported in an earlier section, this survey did not capture much that distinguishes programs among institutions for corporation and foundation gifts.

Differences Among Sets of Institutions

Although the fund raising methods survey was designed to identify only the most general aspects of actual fund raising programs, results from

Table 5

Corporation and Foundation Fund Raising Efforts Outside Region

Donor Group	Degree of Involvement	Total (n=73)		Private (n=37)		Public (n=36)	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Corporations	extensive	13	17.8	10	27.0	3	8.3
	moderate	17	23.2	5	13.5	12	33.3
	minimal or none	43	58.9	22	59.5	21	58.3
Foundations	extensive	18	24.6	14	37.8	4	11.1
	moderate	26	35.6	11	29.7	15	41.7
	minimal or none	29	39.7	12	32.4	17	47.2

earlier parts of the study on institutional characteristics, outcomes, and fund raising expenditures suggested there might be differences in fund raising methods between private and public institutions and between institutions having high and low fund raising outcomes. Detailed results of differences between these sets of institutions are reported in Working Papers Nos. 3 and 4.

Results of this part of the research related to institutions with high and low outcomes were somewhat surprising. We anticipated finding that high outcome institutions would more often have program features not found in low outcome institutions, but this was not generally the case. For the 46 items listed in Table 4, the largest difference among responses on any item from high outcome institutions and low outcome institutions was only 7 percentage points. One possible conclusion is that features frequently reported on the survey represent standard practice in most institutions with formal fund raising programs, regardless of level of outcome. However, there were some differences for private and public institutions.

For the 46 items, responses for private and public institutions differed by more than 20 percentage points for only 12 items, which are shown in Table 6.

For all but one item, private institutions had a higher percentage of positive responses than public. The one exception was for the item regarding the involvement of deans and other academic administrators in fund raising goal-setting. Almost 60% of respondents from public institutions reported involvement of academic administrators, compared to only 27% of respondents from private institutions.

The largest difference in percentage points between private and public institutions occurred for the item related to solicitation of parents for

Table 6

Selected "Yes-No" Items For Private and Public Institutions

No.	Item	% of Priv. Insts. (n=37)	% of Pub. Insts. (n=36)	Difference in percen- tage points
17	pre-set goals for alumni gifts	86.5	66.7	19.8
24	pre-set goals for non-alumni gifts	70.3	50.0	20.3
30	pre-set goals for corporation gifts	64.9	44.4	20.5
29	pre-set goals for foundation gifts	64.9	44.4	20.5
31	trustees involved in fund raising goal-setting	62.2	41.7	20.5
38	finance administrators involved in fund raising goal-setting	56.8	22.7	34.1
37	deans involved in fund raising goal-setting	27.0	58.3	31.1
34	class agent program for alumni gifts	62.2	30.6	31.6
35	solicit students for alumni gifts	56.8	33.3	23.5
33	phonothons for non-alumni gifts	59.5	38.9	20.6
25	solicit parents for non-alumni gifts	81.1	36.1	45.0
20	mass mailings for non-alumni gifts	83.8	55.6	28.2

non-alumni gifts. Private institutions reported parent solicitation 81% of the time, compared to only 36% of the time for public institutions, for a difference of 45 percentage points.

Public institutions also appear less likely than private to set goals for specific donor groups, to involve trustees or financial administrators in goal-setting, and to use phonothons and mass mailings for non-alumni gifts.

Duration of Programs

We asked respondents to indicate the length of time their institutions had formal fund raising programs for each donor group. Some of the expected differences between private and public and high and low outcome institutions appeared in these responses, as indicated in Table 7.

Public institutions had a higher percent of "newer" programs for each donor group than private institutions. The figures for public institutions indicate that the majority of programs for each donor group are under ten years' duration, while the majority of programs in private institutions for each donor group have been in existence for ten or more years.

As in other parts of the survey, the differences are not as clear between high and low outcome institutions, although the largest number of programs for low institutions were of less than ten years' duration for each donor group. Institutions with low outcomes had newer programs for alumni gifts, non-alumni gifts, and corporation gifts.

Administrative Support Systems

This survey included items about management information systems, donor research systems, and the involvement of other institutional constituencies in direct fund raising activities.

As indicated on Table 4, 98.6% of respondents reported that their management information systems were at least partly automated; as item 22

Table 7

Duration of Formal Programs for Specific Donor Groups

	<u>Duration of Program</u>					
	Over 25 years		10 to 25 years		under 10 years	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<u>For Alumni Gifts</u>						
Private (N = 37)	13	35.1	12	32.4	12	32.4
Public (N = 36)	6	16.7	8	22.2	22	61.1
High (N = 37)	12	32.4	11	29.7	14	37.8
Low (N = 36)	7	19.4	9	25.0	20	55.6
<u>For Non-alumni Gifts</u>						
Private (N = 37)	11	29.7	13	35.1	13	35.1
Public (N = 36)	2	5.6	14	38.9	20	55.6
High (N = 35)	9	25.7	11	31.4	15	42.9
Low (N = 38)	4	10.5	16	42.1	18	47.4
<u>For Corporation Gifts</u>						
Private (N = 35)	6	17.1	15	42.9	14	40.0
Public (N = 36)	2	5.6	5	13.9	29	80.6
High (N = 38)	2	5.3	14	36.8	22	57.9
Low (N = 33)	6	18.2	6	18.2	21	63.6
<u>For Foundation Gifts</u>						
Private (N = 35)	6	17.1	17	48.6	12	34.3
Public (N = 36)	2	5.6	6	16.7	28	77.8
High (N = 32)	1	3.1	12	37.5	19	59.4
Low (N = 39)	7	17.9	11	28.2	21	53.8

indicates, 65.8% of respondents reported that their donor research systems were at least partly automated. There were no large differences for private and public nor high and low institutions for these items.

Another possible kind of support system for fund raising activities is that provided by the efforts of other institutional constituencies. We asked respondents to specify the degree of involvement (extensive, moderate, minimal or none) of their presidents, trustees, and faculties in direct fund raising activities. Results are shown in Table 8.

Among all institutions, presidents had extensive involvement at 50.7% of institutions and minimal or none at 13.7%. Faculty had extensive involvement at 6.8% and minimal or none at 64.4%.

Of the 37 institutions reporting extensive involvement of the president, 24 were private, and 13 were public. Of the 47 institutions reporting minimal or no involvement of the faculty, the numbers of private and public were more balanced at 25 and 22, respectively. These figures indicate that extensive presidential involvement is more likely to occur at private institutions, but minimal or no involvement of faculty is equally likely at private and public institutions. Trustees were more likely to be extensively involved at private than at public institutions, but in neither set of institutions was extensive trustee involvement common (only 21.9% of all institutions).

Ratings of Programs

In the telephone survey, we asked respondents to rate the overall success of their fund raising programs for each donor group from 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent). In order to compare the ratings based on our data and the ratings assigned by respondents we converted our ratings from a scale of 1 to 7 (high) to the same scale used by respondents (using 1 = 1.4,

Table 8

Direct Involvement of Others In Fund Raising Activities

Constituency	Degree of Involve- ment	Total (n=73)		Private (n=37)		Public (n=36)	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
President	extensive	37	50.7	24	64.9	13	36.1
	moderate	26	35.6	10	27.0	16	44.4
	minimal or none	10	13.7	3	8.1	7	19.4
Trustees	extensive	16	21.9	10	27.0	6	16.7
	moderate	28	38.4	14	37.8	14	38.9
	minimal or none	29	39.7	13	35.1	16	44.4
Faculty	extensive	5	6.8	3	8.1	2	5.6
	moderate	21	28.8	9	24.3	12	33.3
	minimal or none	47	64.4	25	67.6	22	61.1

based on the ratio 10:7). Table 9 contains the overall averages of respondents' ratings and our ratings for specific donor groups for private and public institutions, and for high and low institutions.

For private and public institutions the overall average for our ratings is somewhat lower than the overall average for ratings assigned by respondents for all donor groups but foundation donors for public institutions. Our overall average ratings more clearly distinguish high and low outcome institutions than do respondents' ratings. Our ratings for high institutions are higher in each case than respondents' and much lower in each case for low institutions.

Correlation coefficients for our ratings and respondents' ratings for each institution also indicated that there was little agreement in the sets of ratings. The coefficients were as follows: alumni gifts, .095; non-alumni gifts, .052; corporation gifts, .227; and foundation gifts, .071.

Our ratings reflect comparisons among institutions within types; respondents' ratings most likely reflect longitudinal comparisons of their own outcomes. These are two different perspectives with sometimes very different outcomes. The effect of ratings produced by different perspectives can be important. For example, a certain public doctoral university received a rating of "5" based on our data for alumni gifts, indicating that this institution, compared with others of its type, is above the median for support from this donor group. The respondent from this institution rated the overall success of alumni fund raising at "1," (the poorest rating possible, and the only "1" given by any respondent in any institution in the survey) and added, "We have the lousiest alumni program of any school in the country."

This response, in light of the empirical evidence, indicates that some fund raising practitioners and administrators might find it enlightening to

Table 9

Overall Average Ratings of Success of Fund Raising Programs

	<u>Donor Group</u>							
	Alumni		Non-alumni		Corporation		Foundation	
	Theirs	Ours	Theirs	Ours	Theirs	Ours	Theirs	Ours
Private	6.6	5.2	6.5	5.2	6.2	5.4	6.5	5.2
Public	5.9	5.7	6.2	5.6	5.7	5.4	4.5	5.8
High	6.2	7.6	6.1	7.2	6.3	7.3	5.9	7.7
Low	6.3	3.3	6.6	3.7	5.6	3.4	5.1	3.6

use comparative (across institutions) methods in addition to the ones they now use for evaluating the success of their fund raising programs. Working Paper No. 2 and, in preparation, No. 6 present a procedure for use in individual institutions for identifying appropriate peer groups for fund raising comparisons.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this survey was to identify and compare general features of fund raising programs in higher education institutions quite diverse in basic characteristics and fund raising outcomes. We anticipated that the survey results would distinguish between private and public institutions, and between institutions with high and low outcomes in voluntary support. Although some differences did occur, in general the survey results attest more to common features at these institutions than to features which differentiate them. As indicated earlier, the majority of respondents said yes to 31 of the 46 "yes-no" items (see Table 4) on the survey. More than 75% of all respondents indicated that at their institutions they:

- have pre-set goals for total voluntary support;
- use yearly total voluntary support most often as the basis for year-end evaluation and for setting new goals;
- involve fund raising staff and the president in goal-setting;
- have automated (part or total) management information systems;
- use mass mailings and phonothons to solicit alumni gifts;
- hold special regional alumni events;
- use alumni volunteers as phonothon callers;
- have an organized effort underway to identify alumni with potential for larger gifts;

- solicit faculty and staff for gifts;
- have an organized effort underway to identify new non-alumni, corporation, and foundation donors; and
- have matching gifts programs.

Since substantial differences in responses among sets of institutions did not appear, this list probably represents a standard core of established activities in higher education institutions with systematic fund raising programs.

Results from earlier steps in this research verify that high outcomes with each donor group are possible for each type of private and public institution and that no institution is automatically excluded on the grounds of "inadequate" basic characteristics from greater aspirations in fund raising. This step of the research verifies that the use of standard methods and approaches does not automatically insure success in fund raising.

In the introduction it was noted that results of previous steps in this research indicated, among other things, that the traditional conceptualization of factors leading to fund raising success does not adequately explain why some institutions raise considerably more money in voluntary support than other similar institutions. The results of this part of the research support that same conclusion and provide evidence of the need for further research and analysis, both at the level of individual institutions and for higher education in general.

It is now necessary and possible to conduct applied research that can be used to improve fund raising practice in individual institutions. The most fruitful areas for research will be those which increase understanding of the subtle, even more artistic, aspects of successful fund raising --

quality of leadership, for instance. Another important area, one in which both qualitative and quantitative research is required, is the study of potential for fund raising success, to distinguish between "effective" institutions and "fortunate" ones (Pickett, 1977).

The strongest messages for practitioners and managers in fund raising to emerge from this step of the research are those which emerged from earlier steps:

1. expand and develop your institution's capacity to conduct systematic evaluation, including detailed inter-institutional comparisons, of your current fund raising programs, management procedures, and outcomes;
2. challenge and seek to verify every assumption you now make about your institution's "limits" regarding fund raising outcomes -- because the chances are good that there is an institution very much like yours where those limits have been transcended.

REFERENCES

- Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1984). Voluntary support of education 1982-83. New York: Author.
- Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1985). Voluntary support of education 1983-84. New York: Author.
- Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1986). Voluntary support of education 1984-85. New York: Author.
- Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1987). Voluntary support of education 1985-86. New York: Author.
- Duronio, M. A., Loessin, B. L., & Borton, G. L. (1987). Relationships of institutional characteristics to high, middle, and low levels of voluntary support. Paper presented at Annual Conference, Northeast Association for Institutional Research, Rochester, NY. Working Paper No. 4.
- Duronio, M. A., Loessin, B. L., & Borton, G. L. (in preparation). Debunking the myth of factors accounting for fund raising success. Paper to be presented at Annual Conference, Association for Institutional Research, May, 1988, Phoenix. Working Paper No. 7.
- Duronio, M. A., Loessin, B. L., & Borton, G. L. (in preparation). Fund raising research: review of literature. Working Paper No. 8.
- Duronio, M. A., Loessin, B. L., & Borton, G. L. (in preparation). Results of fund raising research: implications for planning. Working Paper No. 10.
- Loessin, B. L., Duronio, M. A., & Borton, G. L. (1987). Correlates of fund raising outcomes for four donor groups. Paper presented at Annual Conference, American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. Working Paper No. 1.

- Loessin, B. L., Duronio, M. A., & Borton, G. L. (1987). Fund raising effectiveness in higher education. Paper presented at Annual Conference, Association for the Study of Higher Education, Baltimore. Working Paper No. 3.
- Loessin, B. L., Duronio, M. A., & Borton, G. L. (1987). Identifying peer institutions for comparative evaluation of fund raising effectiveness. Paper presented at Annual Forum, Association for Institutional Research, Kansas City, MO. Working Paper No. 2.
- Loessin, B. L., Duronio, M. A., & Borton, G. L. (1988). Understanding fund raising effectiveness in higher education: laying a foundation. Final Report.
- Loessin, B. A., Duronio, M. A., & Borton, G. L. (in preparation). Defining and determining potential for fund raising success. Working Paper No. 9.
- Loessin, B. A., Duronio, M. A., & Borton, G. L. (in preparation). Methodologies for peer group identification for fund raising comparisons. Working Paper No. 6.
- Pickett, W. L. (1977). An assessment of the effectiveness of fund raising policies of private undergraduate colleges. Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver.